

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-65 remain pending in the application. The amendments to the specification as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed September 14, 2007 is addressed hereinafter.

First, acknowledgement of the substitute sheets of Formal Drawings submitted on June 21, 2007 is respectfully requested. Box 10) of the “Office Action Summary” was left blank.

Next, Claims 1-65 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,852,722 to Hamilton.

Claim 1 is repeated for convenient reference below.

A method of automatically generating a configuration for a network device, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:
 receiving a partial configuration for a network device, wherein the partial configuration comprises a plurality of configuration commands, wherein each of one or more of the configuration commands is associated with one of a plurality of user interface elements;
 parsing the partial configuration to identify the user interface elements;
 generating a local user interface page based on the user interface elements;
 receiving one or more configuration parameter values via the user interface page;
 and
 substituting the configuration parameter values into the partial configuration to result in creating a complete configuration for the device;
 wherein the partial configuration is at least partially customized with one or more configuration parameter values specific to a network service provider prior to shipment of the network device to a user.

The Office Action does not state which part of Hamilton’s disclosure corresponds to the claimed method steps. Having no better information available to make this determination, it will be assumed that Hamilton’s “configuration procedure client module 118” (col. 5, line 24) is intended to correspond to the claimed step of “receiving a partial configuration . . .”.

If so, this rejection is defective because Hamilton’s client module 118 is not described as comprising “a plurality of configuration commands . . . associated with one or more . . . user

interface elements” as claimed. Instead, Hamilton’s client module 118 “handles the autoconfiguration process” (col. 3, lines 54-55) and “establishing a connection with a local service provider” (col. 5, lines 32-34; FIG. 3 step 316). However, as is implied by the term “autoconfiguration”, Hamilton’s client module 118 achieves this without the use of any user interface elements, local or otherwise.

The Office Action is also silent as to which portion of Hamilton corresponds to the claimed “local user interface page”. Additionally, within the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action misquotes this Claim, leaving out the word “local” (Office Action, page 3, line 5). This is significant because claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and 65 recite at least “generating a local user interface” (Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and 65). Support for a local user interface can be found within Applicant’s specification at least at paragraph 0049 and FIG. 4 (Subscriber 140 and User 142 shown within one common block and separate from the Network 105.).

Again having no better information to go by, Applicant notes that Hamilton refers to a user interface 109 present on the home network client computer 102. However, this user interface 109 is not involved in the configuration process whatsoever, and is not mentioned anywhere within the portions of Hamilton cited within the Office Action. Within Hamilton, the updating of configuration data is not performed locally, and not through the user interface 109. Instead, updating is instead performed by the autoconfiguration server 104, which is never in the same physical location as any of the home network client computers 102, and thus can not be described as “local”.

Because Hamilton does not disclose or suggest a user interface page, either local or otherwise, Hamilton cannot disclose or suggest the claimed steps of “receiving one or more configuration parameter values via the user interface page” or “substituting the configuration parameter values into the partial configuration to result in creating a complete configuration for the device”.

In light of the deficiencies in the rejections of independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of dependent claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53, 55-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53, 55-64 depend from their respective independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 and include each and every feature of the independent claims. The independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 32, 43, 54 are patentable over Hamilton for the reasons given above. Therefore, dependent Claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53 and 55-64 are also patentable over Hamilton. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of Claims 2-11, 13-20, 22-31, 33-42, 44-53 and 55-64.

Applicant has considered Hamilton et al. in its entirety as well as the context of the passages cited in the Office Action. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

No extension fee is believed to be due. However, to the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in relation to this application to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Please contact the undersigned by telephone relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

/ChristopherMTanner#41518/
Christopher M. Tanner, Reg. No. 41,518

Dated: November 14, 2007

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Tel: (408) 414-1238
Fax: (408) 414-1076

Attorney Docket No.: 50325-0782